

REMARKS

Claims 7-9, 19-24, 29-35, and 38-46 are pending, with claims 7, 8, 29, 30, and 38 being independent. Claims 7, 8, 29, 30, and 38 have been amended; claims 10-12, 25-28, 36, and 37 have been canceled; and claims 39-46 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found in the originally-filed specification, at least at page 8, line 3 to page 9, line 4 and Figs. 1-2B. No new matter has been added.

Claims 7, 8, 30, and 38 have each been amended to recite, among other features, a light emitting device in which an electric potential of a source line is the same as that of a power source line.

Claim 29 has been amended to recite, among other features, a light emitting device in which an electric potential supplied to a second TFT electrically connected to a source line is the same as that of a power source line.

Claims 7-9, 21-24, 30, 34, and 35:

Claims 7-9, 21-24, 30, 34, and 35 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,760,004 (Koyama). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because neither of Koyama's designs describes or suggests a light emitting device in which an electric potential of a source line is the same as that of a power source line, as recited in independent claims 7, 8, and 30.

Koyama's first design is shown in Figs. 2-6. In the first design, the EL display device includes a pixel having a source signal line and a power supply line. See Koyama at Fig. 3. In Koyama's first design, there is no description or suggestion that the source signal line has an electric potential that is the same as that of the power source line. Koyama merely explains that signals "to be inputted to the signal lines are created in such a way that a data signal (video signal) externally inputted is edited by a signal line driving circuit." See Koyama at col. 2, lines 1-3. There is nothing in Koyama that describes the electric potential of the source signal line relative to the power source line.

Koyama's second design is shown in Figs. 1 and 7-12. In the second design, the EL display device includes a pixel having a switching TFT 1101, an EL element 1102, a gate signal line G1, and a source signal line S1. See Koyama at col. 8, lines 29-54 and Fig. 12. The source signal line driving circuit produces a source signal line that feeds into the pixel. See Koyama at Fig. 7. The source signal line driving circuit also receives a digital gradation signal VD as input. See Koyama at col. 8, line 66 to col. 9, line 12 and Fig. 7. In Koyama's second design, there is no description of a potential of a power source line relative to the source signal line.

For at least these reasons, Koyama's designs fail to describe or suggest that an electric potential of the source signal line is the same as that of the power source line. Accordingly, independent claims 7, 8, and 30 are allowable over Koyama. Claims 9, 21-24, 34, and 35 depend from claims 7, 8, or 30, and are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 7, 8, and 30 are allowable and for containing allowable subject matter in their own right.

For example, claim 9 depends from claim 8, and recites that the first electric potential of the first source line is different from the second electric potential of the second source line. Koyama fails to describe or suggest at least these features. In Koyama, the power supply lines V_1 - V_X are held at a predetermined power source potential. See Koyama at col. 3, lines 51-52. Therefore, Koyama does not describe or suggest that an electric potential of one of the power supply lines is different from an electric potential of another of the power supply lines.

Claims 19, 20, and 31:

Claims 19, 20, and 31, which depend from claims 7, 8, and 30, respectively, have been rejected as being obvious over Koyama in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0018060 (Yamazaki). Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection because Yamazaki does not remedy the failure of Koyama to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 7, 8, and 30. In particular, Yamazaki also fails to describe or suggest a light emitting device in which an electric potential of a source line is the same as that of a power source line. For at least this reason, claims 7, 8, and 30 are allowable over any possible combination of Koyama and Yamazaki, as are claims 19, 20, and 31.

Claims 29, 32, 33, and 38:

Claims 29, 32, 33, and 38 have been rejected as being obvious over Koyama in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0012704 (Chimura). Applicant request withdrawal of this rejection because Koyama fails to describe or suggest all of the features of claims 29 and 38, and Chimura does not remedy the failures of Koyama.

As discussed above with respect to claims 7, 8, and 30, Koyama fails to describe or suggest a light emitting device in which an electric potential of a source line is the same as that of a power source line, as is also recited in claim 38. Furthermore, Chimura does not describe that a power source is connected to a power source line of a pixel portion, and therefore Chimura also fails to describe that an electric potential of the source line 1002 is the same as that of a power source line. See Chimura at Paragraph 0044 and Fig. 1. For at least these reasons, claim 38 is allowable over any possible combination of Koyama and Chimura.

Koyama also fails to describe or suggest a light emitting element in which an electric potential supplied to a second TFT of a source line driving circuit is the same as that of the power source line, as recited in claim 29. In Koyama, as discussed above, there is no description of the relative potentials between the source signal line driving circuit 100, or of the components of the source signal line driving circuit, and a power source line. See Koyama at Figs. 1 and 7. Moreover, Chimura does not remedy the failure of Koyama. As discussed above, in Chimura there is no description of the power source being connected to a power source line of a pixel portion. Thus, Chimura also necessarily fails to provide information about the potential of the source driver circuit, or of the components of the source driver circuit, relative to a power source line. For at least these reasons, claim 29 is allowable over any possible combination of Koyama and Chimura. Claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 29, and are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 29 is allowable.

New Claims 39-46:

Claims 39-46 depend from the independent claims, and are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claims are allowable.

The fee in the amount of \$910 in payment of a Request for Continued Examination (\$790) and for a one-month extension of time fee (\$120) is being paid concurrently herewith on

Applicant : Mitsuaki Osame et al.
Serial No. : 10/630,939
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-161001 / US6532

the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 26, 2006

/Diana DiBerardino/

Diana DiBerardino

Reg. No. 45,653

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331